

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 7, 9-12, and 14-16 are currently pending. Claims 7 and 12, which are independent, are amended. Support for the amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at page 18 and Figure 11.

No new matter has been introduced. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 9-11, 12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0015804 to LaJoie (hereinafter, merely “LaJoie”) in view of “DVB Document A038: Specification for service information (SI) in Digital Video Broadcasting (DVB) Systems” (hereinafter, merely “DVB A038”) and further in view of “Digital Video Broadcasting (DVB); Guidelines on implementation and usage of Service Information (SI), ETR211” (hereinafter, merely “DVB ETR211”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*:

“An information transmission apparatus...

wherein the table is segmented into a plurality of sections with a same format, each section having a section indicator and a last section indicator.” (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that LaJoie, DVB A038, and DVB ETR211, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest wherein the table is segmented into a plurality of sections with a same format, each section having a section indicator and a last section indicator, as recited in claim 7.

Indeed, claim 7 recites segmentation of the table and indicators in each section for indicating section numbers. None of the references relied by the Office Action teaches or discloses the above-identified features of claim 7.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 7, amended independent claim 12 is also patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on

each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portion or portions of the reference or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800